

### **REMARKS**

The Office Action mailed July 19, 2007, was received and its contents carefully reviewed. Claims 1-12 were originally pending. In the above amendments, Applicants amended paragraph [0010] to correct a typographical error that appeared in the published application. Applicants also amended the Abstract of the Disclosure with regard to format and language. Additionally, Applicants amended claims 1, 6, 7, 9, and 12 to highlight additional features of the present invention and to add additional context to the claims. The features incorporated in the above amendments are disclosed in the original Specification as published at least in paragraphs [0006-0009, 0013-0018, and 0020] and throughout the Specification and in the Figures. Additionally, Applicants canceled claims 2 and 11.

Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter was introduced by these amendments. As now recited, claim 1, claims 3-10, and claim 12 remain pending and are believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

#### **A. Objection to the Specification (Abstract of the Disclosure)**

The Examiner objected to the Abstract of the Disclosure with regard to the language and format. Applicants amended the Abstract of the Disclosure to modify format and language as indicated above. Based on the above amendment, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the Abstract of the Disclosure.

#### **B. Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants acknowledge and thank the Examiner for noting that claim 12 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims. In the above amendments, Applicants amended claims 1, 6, 7, 9, and 12 to highlight additional features of the present invention and to add additional

context to the claims. As now recited, claim 1, claims 3-10, and claim 12 are pending and are believed to be in condition for allowance.

**C. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Beck et al. International Publication Number WO 01/17834 (“the Beck reference”). In view of the amendments above and the comments below, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

The present invention pertains to a vehicle air supply system and to a system adaptable to supply large volumes of air at relatively low pressure, such as for tire inflation purposes. For example, amended independent claim 1 now recites a vehicle air supply system including a compressor, an air dryer, a reservoir, and control means. The reservoir is adapted to receive air from the compressor via the air dryer, and the control means are operable to cause a standard regeneration of the air dryer when a predetermined system condition is met. Amended independent claim 1 further recites that the control means are also operable to cause an intermediate regeneration of the air dryer in advance of the predetermined system condition being met, and that the control means are further operable to inhibit the intermediate regeneration. Claim 1 also recites that the control means include a governor adapted to cause a standard regeneration and a governor bypass adapted to cause an intermediate regeneration and that the control means are also adapted to disable the governor bypass to inhibit the intermediate regeneration, as the control means include a timer, which is operable to cause or inhibit the intermediate regeneration.

Applicants amended independent claim 1 to recite control means that include a timer that is operable both to cause or to inhibit the intermediate regeneration of the desiccant. While the Beck reference discloses a vehicle air supply system and a timer to *cause* an intermediate regeneration after the compressor has run for a predetermined period of time, there is no disclosure in the Beck reference of the use of a timer to *inhibit* an intermediate regeneration as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Instead, the Beck reference discloses only that the control means may be adapted to bypass the governor and send an off load/purge signal to the compressor and air dryer using a bypass line for the governor, a valve positioned in the bypass line and a timer to open the valve (see page 2, line 27 to page 3, line 2 of the Beck reference; see also page 6, lines 4-16). Additionally, the Beck reference discloses that the governor bypass arrangement may include a delay means, such as an electronic timer, which is activated in response to a predetermined system parameter and causes an intermediate regeneration after a predetermined time period has elapsed (see page 2, lines 17-21).

In the present invention, the control means include a timer that disables the governor bypass to inhibit intermediate regeneration (see paragraphs [0005, 0006, 0010, and 0020] of the present application). As recited in amended independent claim 1, the control means include a governor adapted to cause a standard regeneration, a governor bypass adapted to cause an intermediate regeneration. The control means recited in amended claim 1 is adapted to inhibit the intermediate regeneration by a timer that is operable to cause or inhibit the intermediate regeneration.

On page 3 of the July 19, 2007, Office Action the Examiner asserts that "...there must be some means to block the signal so as to inhibit an intermediate regeneration or there would always be intermediate regeneration in progress." However, there is no disclosure or suggestion in the Beck reference that the *timer* is operable to inhibit the intermediate regeneration. The Beck reference discloses that intermediate regeneration occurs when the compressor is required to supply volumes of air in excess of those normally required to replenish the reservoir, that is before the reservoir target pressure is reached, to prevent saturation of the desiccant (see page 5, line 29 to page 6, line 2 of the Beck reference). The intermediate regeneration is in response to a reservoir pressure drop. That is, the reservoir must reach a certain pressure before it is deemed to experience a drop and regeneration occurs. The Beck reference discloses that line 38 is pressurized via governor bypass line 40 and pressure line 34. The pressure signal received by the air dryer 14 has the effect of taking the

compressor 12 off load and purging the desiccant. When the purging operation has taken place, the valve 24 reverts to its initial position. The loss of pressure in line 38 brings the compressor 12 on load and the supply of pressurized air to the reservoir 18. Further, there is no disclosure or suggestion in the Beck reference that the *timer* is operable to inhibit the intermediate regeneration.

With respect, the Beck reference fails to disclose or suggest a timer that is operable to inhibit the intermediate regeneration. In failing to disclose such a timer, the Beck reference fails to disclose each and every limitation of amended independent claim 1. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that the Beck reference fails to anticipate independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and that claim 1 is in proper condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of amended independent claim 1 and the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Dependent claims 3-10 and claim 12 ultimately depend upon amended independent claim 1. These dependent claims thereby include all the limitations of amended independent claim 1, while reciting additional features of the present invention. As noted above, Applicants amended independent claim 1 to include features not disclosed by the Beck reference. Accordingly, with the dependency of claims 3-10, and claim 12 upon amended independent claim 1, the Beck reference fails to disclose all of the features recited in these dependent claims as well. Applicant respectfully submits that the Beck reference thereby fails to anticipate claims 3-10, and claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and that these claims are likewise in proper condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration of claims 3-10, and claim 12 and the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

**D. Conclusion**

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of record and allow claim 1, claims 3-10, and claim 12 in the present application to issue. If the Examiner believes that a conference would be beneficial in expediting the prosecution of the present application, Applicants invite the Examiner to telephone counsel to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,

/Joseph A. Parisi, Reg. No. 53,435/  
Joseph A. Parisi  
Registration No. 53,435

NIXON PEABODY LLP  
Suite 900, 401 9<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004-2128  
(202) 585-8000